DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 125 EC 191 746

AUTHOR Heal, Laird W.; And Others
TITLE Meta-Analysis Evaluation Group: First Annual Monograph.
INSTITUTION Illinois Univ., Champaign. Secondary Transition Intervention Effectiveness Inst.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 86
CONTRACT 300-85-0160
NOTE 108p.; For related documents, see EC 191 736-745.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; *Disabilities; *Education Work Relationship; *Job Placement; *Meta Analysis; Program Evaluation; Research Methodology; Secondary Education; *Success; *Transitional Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Office Special Educ Rehabilitative Services

ABSTRACT

Part of a series, this preliminary report is on a meta-analysis study of successful and unsuccessful transition of handicapped youth from secondary education to postsecondary settings. The study had four major objectives: (1) to review annual progress reports of federally funded (Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation) transition projects, (2) to review pertinent literature, (3) to perform meta-analysis by project groups, and (4) to analyze case studies of successful and unsuccessful job placements. The literature review noted a lack of control groups in studies on vocational placement of handicapped youth. The funded projects were analyzed and grouped based on the Proposal Classification Form which considered such features as agency type, project objectives, and student age and type as well as the Project Characteristics Questionnaire which provided information on agency type, student classification, and training and placement practices. The initial review of 56 annual progress reports from the projects found that only 42% of the projects listed objectives of the original proposal in their progress reports and few had met many of their objectives. Finally, no clear trends were observable in the comparison of five pairs of successful and unsuccessful student placements. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

7275

ED279125

Meta-analysis Report

Heal

EC191744

TRANSITION INSTITUTE AT ILLINOIS

The following principles guide our research related to the education and employment of youth and adults with specialized education, training, employment, and adjustment needs.

- Individuals have a basic right to be educated and to work in the environment that least restricts their right to learn and interact with other students and persons who are not handicapped.
- Individuals with varied abilities, social backgrounds, aptitudes, and learning styles must have equal access and opportunity to engage in education and work, and life-long learning.
- Educational experiences must be planned, delivered, and evaluated based upon the unique abilities, social backgrounds, and learning styles of the individual.
- Agencies, organizations, and individuals from a broad array of disciplines and professional fields must effectively and systematically coordinate their efforts to meet individual education and employment needs.
- Individuals grow and mature throughout their lives requiring varying levels and types of educational and employment support.
- The capability of an individual to obtain and hold meaningful and productive employment is important to the individual's quality of life.
- Parents, advocates, and friends form a vitally important social network that is an instrumental aspect of education, transition to employment, and continuing employment.

The Secondary Transition Intervention Effectiveness Institute is funded through the Office of Special Education Programs, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, U.S. Department of Education (contract number 300-85-0160).

Project Officer: Dr. Mel Appell

For more information on the Transition Institute at Illinois, please contact:

Dr. Frank R. Rusch, *Director*
College of Education
University of Illinois
110 Education Building
1310 South Sixth Street
Champaign, Illinois 61820
(217) 333-2325

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

First Annual Monograph

Meta-Analysis Evaluation Group

Laird W. Heal,

Janell I. Haney,

Vicki Bamman,

and

L. Allen Phelps

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Frank R Rusch

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC 19,746

Table of Contents

Section	Objective and Activity		Page
		Credits to cooperating projects	i
		Foreward	xi
A	6.2.3	Develop a framework for the meta-analysis	1
B	6.2.2	Obtain and review pertinent literature	6
C	6.2.4A	Perform meta-analysis by project group A. Classify projects using the Proposal Classification Form	10
D	6.2.4B	Perform meta-analysis by project groups B. Classify projects using the Project Characteristics Questionnaire	21
E	6.2.1	Collect and review initial annual progress (evaluation) reports	38
F	6.2.11	Compare case studies of successful and unsuccessful placements	48
G	6.2.12	Compare OSERs research projects on transition education. (84.158C and 84.158G)	78
H		Year 2 activities	83
I		References	87
[a]Attachments			
A1	6.2.3	Meta-analysis plan. March 1986	2
A2	6.2.3	Year 1 Meta-analysis, Management Plan. August 20, 1985	5
C1	6.2.4A	Proposal Classification Form	20
D1	6.2.4B	Project Characteristics Questionnaire	29
F1	6.2.11	Case Study Checklist and Guidelines	66
G1	6.2.12	Transition Education Summary Analysis Feasibility Questionnaire	80

[a]Attached to the sections with the same letter labels.

CREDITS TO COOPERATING TRANSITION

EDUCATION PROJECTS

The Meta-Analysis Group of the Transition Institute expressed special gratitude to the following projects for taking time from the rigorous schedules in order to complete the five questionnaires that we have distributed. Those not listed should not necessarily be considered unhelpful. Not all projects were eligible for this year's questionnaires, and will have to await a later opportunity to participate. Also, the person listed with each project is not necessarily the respondent to our survey even the directors of the credited project. We try to keep our mailing list current, and we apologize for the occasional inoccurances.

A. Project Identification Questionnaire.

Mailed March 14, 1986, to identify the projects who might be willing to complete a Project Characteristics Questionnaire or a Case Study on both a successfully-placed and an unsuccessfully-placed student. All but 9 of the 105 funded projects from B competitions completed and returned this questionnaire.

B. Feasible Variables Checklist.

Dated January 30, 1986. Mailed to 14 projects, 2 randomly selected from each transition education grant competition.

1. Jack Scott
goodwill Industries of Business
9200 Wisconsin Avenue
Bethesda, MD 20814

2. John Palmer
Human Resources School
Searington Road
Albertson, NY 11507

3. Mitylene Arnold
Georgia Retardation Center
850 college Station Rd.
Athens, GA 30610

8. Frank D. Gentile
Human Resources Center
Vocational Rehab. Serv.
I.U. Wiletts Road
Albertson, NY 11507

9. Charles E. Bradford
Int'l Assoc. of Machinists & Aerospace Workers' Apprenticeship Employment and Training Department
1300 Connecticut Ave. N.W
Washington, DC 20036

4. Gary Gronberg
Director of Organization and
Dir. of Employment, Apprent.
& Training
North Dakota Department of Public
Instruction for Special Education
Capitol Building
Bismark, ND 58505

5. Donna Phillips
Director of Occupational Education
Rochester City School District
131 W. Broad St.
Rochester, NY 14608

6. Dr. Robert N. Ianacone
The George Wasington University
Office of Sponsored Res. for
Dept. of Sp. Ed.
2121 Eye St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20052

7. Bernard Katz
New York University
SEHNAP
Washington Square
New York, NY 10003

10. Dr. Paul Wehman
Virginia commonwealth
University
School of Education
MCV Box 563
Richmond, VA 23298-0001

11. Dr. Dianne Berkell
C.W. Post Center, Long
Island Univ.
Dept. of Special Ed.
Greenvale, NY 11548

12. Dr. Jean F. Mooney
J. Edward Center
Campus School of Multi-
handicapped Children
Commonwealth Avenue
Chestnut Hill, MA 02167

13. E. Lowell Harris
Division of Exceptional
Children
NC Dept. of Public
Instruction
Education Building
Raleigh, NY 27611

14. A. Geneva Quarles
Crippled Children's
Hospital.
2924 Brook Road
Richmond, VA 23220

C. Case Study Checklist.

Mailed April 21, 1986, to those projects who place students into competitive employment.

Providing Innovative Community-Based Services for Mentally Ill Persons Exiting Secondary School Programs.

Dr. Jerry Dincin & Dr. Judith A. Cook, Thresholds, Chicago, IL 60614

The Electronics Industry Enclave Project: A Service Demonstration Model for Post-Secondary Individuals with Severe Handicaps.
Larry E. Rhodes
University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403

Valley Transitional School Project
George Drummond
Valley School, Fisherville, VA 22939

A Model to Provide Secondary Vocational Preparation of 18 to 21 Year Old Special Needs Youth
Vince Svaldi & Wayne Lindskoog
West Metro Ed Center, Hopkins, MN 55343

Community-Based Training
Robert Atkins
The Rehabilitation Institute, Kansas City, MO 64108

Training for Effective Transition: A Transition Program for Post-Secondary Handicapped Adults Residing in a Rural Area
Joyce K. Beam
Charles County Board of Education, Laplata, MD 20646

MEAL (Model for Employment and Adult Services)
Dorothy Crawford
Research and Development Training, Phoenix, AZ 85016

ON-site Employment Training for Handicapped

Devi Jameson

Richmond Unified School District, Richmond, CA 94804

D. Project Characteristics Questionnaire.

Mailed May 22, 1986 to those projects who place students into competitive employment.

Human Resources Center Transition of Severely Disabled Youth from School to Work: A Demonstration Model

Roberta Y. Housman

Voc. Rehab. Services, Albertson, NY 11507

Illinois Competitive Employment Project: Promoting Non-Sheltered Employment Options for Moderately/Severely Handicapped Students

Tom Lagomarcino

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Department of Special Education, Champaign, IL 61820

Providing Innovative Community-Based Services for Mentally Ill Persons Existing Secondary School Programs

Dr. Jerry Dincin & Dr. Judith A. Cook

Thresholds, Chicago, IL 60614

Helping Hand Rehabilitation Ctr.

Fred Peters

Helping Hand Rehabilitation Ctr., Countryside, IL 60525

Experimental Prevocational Planning Project

Kay Holjes

Employment Opportunities, Inc., Durham, NC 27707

A Model Program of Community College Special Education for Mild Mental Retardation

Daniel Close

University of Oregon, Special Education and Rehabilitation, Eugene, OR 97403

Valley Transitional School Project

George Drummond

Valley School, Fisherville, VA 22939

Project REDDY (Real Employment Alternatives for Developmentally Disabled Youth)

Dr. Dianne Berkell

C.W. Post Ctr., Long Island Univ., Dept. Special Education, Greenvale, NY 11548

Secondary School/Post Training Employment Transition Service Demonstration Model Project for Handicapped Students

Robert A. Stodden

Univ. of Hawaii, Honolulu, HI 96822

A Model to Provide Secondary Vocational Preparation of 18 to 21 Year Old Special Needs Youth

Vince Svaldi

West Metro Ed. Center, Hopkins, MN 55343

STEEP (Skills, Training, Evaluation, Education, Placement)

James M. Caccamo Patrick Mcginn

School Dist. of Independence, Independence, MO 64055

Community-Based Training

Robert Atkins

The Rehabilitation Institute, Kansas City, MO 64108

Training for effective Transition: A Transition Program for Post-Secondary Handicapped Adults Residing in a Rural Area.

Joyce K. Beam, Project Director

Charles County Board of Education, Laplata, MD 20646

Project Employment

Michael Kramer

Vocational Adult Institute & Workshop, Inc., New York, NY 10001-2382.

Post-secondary Transitional Programs

Jan Rutt

Vanguard School, Upper School, Paoli, PA 19301

MEAL (Model for Employment and Adult Services)

Dorothy Crawford

Research and Development Training, Phoenix, AZ 85016

Model-Post-Secondary: Improving the Post-Secondary Education and Employability of Learning Disabled Students

Christine Gianopoulos

Center for Research and Advanced Study, University of Southern Main, Portland, ME 04102

Competitive Employment for Mentally Retarded Young Adults

Dr. Paul Wehman & Herbert Chermside

Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA 23298-0001

Post-Secondary Education/Rehabilitation Transition for Mildly Mentally retarded and Learning Disabled

Tom E. Bass and Patrick Poplin

VA Dept. of Ed., Richmond, VA 23216

Job Training and Try Out: Model Program Designed to Meet Transitional Needs of Out of Work/Out of School Handicapped Individuals Ages 18-11

Dr. George Tilson

The George Washington Univ., Washington, DC 20052 (old address: 11600 Nevel St., Suite 114, Rockville, MD 20825).

To Build Partnerships for Transitional Services for Handicapped Youth

Thomas Murphy & Joseph Pasanella

Santa Barbara High School District, Santa Barbara, CA 93103

PROGRESS (Providing Realistic Opportunities for Gainful Rehabilitative Employment Success in Society)

JoAnn Hankey

Asso. for Retarded Citizens, Centre County, PA, Inc., State College, PA 16801

Project LIVE (Learning Independence in Varied Environments)

Gerry Schwarzentraub

Stockton Unified School District, Stockton, CA 95202

Project Interface 84.023N

Justin Marino

Arizona State Univ., Tempe, A 85287

OLTA DOO NAA NISHJI: School-to-Work

Sherry A. Curley & Elmer J. Guy

Navajo Vocational Rehab. Program, Window Rock, AZ 96515

E. Transition Education Summary Analysis Feasibility Questionnaire Mailed February 10, 1986. The 14 projects funded under Competition 84.158G.

Dr. Eugene Edgar

University of Washington, 103 Miller Building, DQ-12, Seattle, WA 98195

Dr. Martin Agran

Department of Special Education, Utah State University, Logan, UT 84321

Dr. Carol Weller

University of Utah, 227 Milton Bennion Hall, Salt Lake City, UT 84112

Dr. Thomas Lovitt

Experimental Education Unit WJ-10, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195

Dr. Milton Budoff

Research Institute for Education, 29 Ware St., Cambridge, MA 02138

Dr. Stan Karcz

University of Wisconsin/Stout, Harvey Hall 201C, Menomonie, WI 54751

Dr. Robert Erickson

University of Wisconsin/Madison, 432 N. Murray, Madison, WI 53706

Dr. Steven R. Lyon

University of Pittsburgh, 5M215 Forbes Quadrangle, Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Tom Kiuwen

Guallaudet College, 800 Florida Ave., N.E., Washington, DC 20002

Dr. Robert A. Stodden

University of Hawaii, 2444 Dole St., Honolulu, HI 96822

Dr. Joanna Williams

Columbia University/Teachers College, New York, NY 10027

Dr. Edward S. Shapiro

Lehigh University, Building 2, School of Education, Bethlehem, PA 18015

Dr. Jean Edwards

Portland State University, P.O. Box 751, Portland, OR 97207

Foreword

The First Annual Monograph of the Meta-Analysis Group at the Transition Institute at the University of Illinois summarizes the group's first year's objectives and accomplishments. First (Section A) the meta-analysis plan (Objective 6.3.2) is presented. Then (Section B) comes a brief literature review followed by several presentations of empirical information (Sections C thru G), all of which are ultimately aimed at combining data from all the OSERS-funded Transition Education projects that place students from school to work settings. Finally, Section H describes a plan of research for Year 2.

L.W.H.

J.I.H.

META-ANALYSIS MONOGRAPH

A. Develop a framework for Meta-Analysis

A meta-analysis is an aggregation of information from a number of primary sources. As applied in the present series, it will be an aggregation of information about successful and unsuccessful transition from secondary education to postsecondary settings--information provided by the projects that are being funded by the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS).

The Meta-Analysis Plan (Objective 6.3.2)

The meta-analysis plan was prepared on schedule for the March 15 monthly report. This plan appears as Attachment A1. The schedule of activities from this plan shows that the group has assumed four major responsibilities:

1. review annual progress reports (Objective 6.2.1)
2. review pertinent literature (Objective 6.2.2)
3. perform meta-analysis by project groups (Objective 6.2.4)
4. analyze case studies of successful and unsuccessful job placements (Objective 6.2.11)

Preliminary reports on these four appear in the present report. The schedule of completion appears in Attachment A1.

Attachment A1

Transition Education Meta-analysis Plan

March 10, 1986

Laird W. Heal

Janell I. Haney

The plan for the Meta-analysis of the Transition Institute consists of an elaboration of the management plan from the original (1985) proposal, which is shown below on attachment A2. The expansion involves Objectives 6.2.11 and 6.2.12. These objectives are new and were not mentioned in the original proposal.

Objective 6.2.11, "Case Studies of Successful and Unsuccessful Placements," is a project to ask the OSERS service projects to nominate successful and unsuccessful placements of students from high school training programs into the competitive employment marketplace. Each project will be asked to nominate a typical successful case and a typical unsuccessful case. The reasons for success or failure will be noted in a case study that will be completed according to a structured format. This format will yield both objective and subjective information about these cases. During the early summer (of 1986) the Meta-analysis project staff will complete a content analysis of these data and write a report highlighting the variables that discriminate between successful and unsuccessful transition education placement.

Objective 6.2.12, "Compare OSERS Research Projects from Competition 84.158G" will compare the <u>research</u> projects in transition education that were funded by OSERS in 1984. Only 14 of these projects were funded, and

the comparisons will probably be tentative at this early date, but the framework for classifying and collecting data from these projects will at least be put in place, and a more complete research plan will be put in place for FY 1986-87.

The "Meta-analysis Plan 6.2 Expansion Timetable" is attached. This timetable shows the activity schedule for the 10 objectives listed in the Transition Institute contract proposal and the two (6.2.11 and 6.2.12) added above.

Meta-Analysis Plan 6.2 -- Expansion Timetable

		1985 Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	1986 Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug
6.2.2	Literature Review of Previous Placement Research											
	1. Collect and read literature	x	x	x	x	x	x					
	2. Write literature review (6.2.2)							x				
	3. Write report on meta-analysis procedures (6.2.9)									x		
	4. Submit article on meta-analysis procedures (6.2.10)										x	
6.2.4	Compare OSERS Research Projects by Project Groups											
	1. Determine classification and dependent variables	x	x	x	x	x	x					
	2. Get data from those projects that can be compared (6.2.4)						x	x				
	3. Analyze data (6.2.4)								x	x		
	4. Write draft report (6.2.5)								x			
	5. Review of draft report by Institute Advisory Committee, RTI Staff, and federal project officer (6.2.6)									x		
	6. Make needed revisions (6.2.7)										x	
	7. Submit/disseminate final report (6.2.8)											x
6.2.11	Case Studies of Successful and Unsuccessful Placements											
	1. Identify projects that place students					x						
	2. Make up case study topics form						x					
	3. Recruit 1 typical success and 1 typical failure from each							x				
	4. Get Data								x	x		
	5. Do preliminary content analysis of data									x		
	6. Analyze preliminary results										x	
	7. Write report											
6.2.12	Compare OSERS Research Projects (84.158G)											
	1. Determine classification and dependent variables					x	x	x	x	x		
	2. Prepare plan for meta-analysis of research projects										x	x

Office of Career Development
for Special Populations

Attachment A2

MANAGEMENT PLAN

OBJECTIVE (6.2): Conduct meta-analyses of model programs to delineate objectives

PROJECT: Secondary/Transition Institute

TASK 6: Evaluation

OBJECTIVE MANAGER: Dr. Laird Heal

	ACTIVITY	PRODUCT	DATE OF INITIATION	DATE OF COMPLETION	PERSONNEL* INVOLVEMENT
6.2.1	Collect and review the initial annual project progress/evaluation reports	initial review notes	8-21-85	on-going	LH, GRA 7
6.2.2	Obtain and review other pertinent literature (Task 1.0)		8-21-85	on-ging	LH, GRA 7, AP
6.2.3	Develop a framework for the meta-analysis	Completed framework	1-1-86	3-1-86	LH, AP, GRA 7
6.2.4	Perform the meta-analyses by project groups (5)		4-15-86	5-15-86	LH, GRA 7
6.2.5	Produce draft meta-analysis reports	Draft reports	5-1-86	6-1-86	LH, GRA 7
6.2.6	Submit the draft report(s) for review by Institute Advisory Committee, RTI staff, and federal project officer		6-1-86	6-15-86	LH, IAC, RTI, PO
6.2.7	Make needed revisions		6-10-86	6-30-86	LH, GRA 7
6.2.8	Submit/disseminate final meta-analysis reports	Final reports	8-1-86	2-20-86	LH, AP
6.2.9	Review and evaluate meta-analysis procedures		7-1-86	8-20-86	LH, GRA 7, AP
6.2.10	Develop and submit articles on meta-analysis procedures/ findings	Journal articles	6-15-86	8-20-86	LH, GRA 7

*Key

LH = Dr. Laird Heal
GRA 7 - Graduate Research Assistant
AP - Dr. A. Phelps
IAC - Institute Advisory Committee
RTI - Research Triangle Institute staff
PO - Project Officer

B. Obtain and Review Relevant Literature

Meta-analysis is the name that has been applied to a recent strategy of combining research data from a number of studies. This strategy has been most noticeably identified with Glass, McGaw, and Smith (1981), but a number of others have made important contributions to this methodology and its rationale. Bangert-Drowns (1984) has provided an especially insightful historical review, and Hedges (1985) has presented advanced statistical procedures.

The meta-analysis strategy for combining data from a number of studies employs the following procedure:

1. Locate all studies that ask the same question regarding the relationship between an independent variable (an intervention) and a dependent variable (an outcome measure)
2. Convert every comparison in every study that contrasts an experimental group with a control group to a test statistic; this is usually the effect size, which is defined as the difference between the two groups' means divided by the standard deviation of the control group
3. Calculate the average effect size for all comparisons in all studies; This statistic, like any z-score, has a theoretical mean of zero and a practical range from -3.0 to +3.0
4. Interpret the results--a positive effect size means that the experimental groups had higher average outcome scores than the control groups; however, ordinarily an effect size must reach a quarter of a standard deviation (+.25) in order to be considered practically important.

It should not be surprising that this meta-analysis procedure has become popular to combine the effects of special education interventions since many "efficacy studies" undertaken to evaluate them have compared treated and untreated groups. Kavale and his associates have been particularly active. In their review of meta-analyses in special education, Kavale and Glass (1982) discussed meta-analyses of five different literatures in special education: a) Special class vs. regular class placement, b) psycholinguistic training using the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Ability as the outcome measure and training guide, c) perceptual-motor training, d) stimulant drugs as treatment for hyperactive behavior, and e) diet as treatment for hyperactive behavior. Effect sizes were positive (favorable toward the intervention) for nearly all analyses, approaching 1.0 for drug treatment of hyperactivity, and approaching 0.0 for diet control of hyperactivity. However, the average effect size for academic outcome after special placement was -.14 for educably mentally retarded students and -.34 for "slow learners." Special class outcomes for social variables were more positive, the average effect size being .29. In addition to the studies reviewed by Kavale and Glass, a number of recent meta-analyses have investigated the effectiveness of early intervention. Lazar and Darlington (1982), Snyder & Sheehan (1983) and White and Casto (1985), among others, reported effect sizes ranging from +.3 to +.5 for the immediate effects of early intervention on the school readiness of handicapped and disadvantaged children.

Conspicuously absent from this literature as a meta-analysis comparing vocational placement strategies for handicapped youth. Unfortunately, very few studies of vocational placement of handicapped youth have employed control groups, making it impossible to calculate a conventional effect

size. Nevertheless, some studies have been completed, and they have been expertly reviewed by Cobb (1972), Conley (1973), and Kolstoe (1975). The stunning result of these studies is that youths who are followed after graduation from special education programs have an employment history that is very similar to their nonhandicapped peers of a comparable socioeconomic status. Cobb remarked that employment success for handicapped workers often comes after many unsuccessful attempts. Conley's analysis was more refined, in that he considered the ages of the cohorts that were studied by the various investigators. He found that the employment rate of "graduates" of special education programs was less than 10 percent below that of their same-age peers.

The studies in Cobb's (1972) and Conley's (1973) reviews were based primarily on mildly mentally retarded youths. In one classic study by Saenger (1957) followed 520 moderately mentally retarded (IQ range: 40-50) "graduates" of New York City's special education programs over the 25-year period from 1929 to 1956. He found that fully 37 percent of these graduates were gainfully employed. Clearly, the past practices have resulted in the gainful employment of most of the graduates of special education programs, leaving open to question the wisdom of spending extraordinary resources to do better.

Kolstoe (1975) in reviewing the reasons for unsuccessful job placement, concluded that most placement failures result from social incompetence, not skill deficiencies. Kolstoe emphasized the importance of providing environmental and training supports for the handicapped individual at the job site.

Following the instatement of the law requiring public educational services for all handicapped youths through age 21 (P.L. 94-142), increas-

ing concern has been given to the transition of moderately and severely mentally retarded youths from school to adult living. While many services have been forthcoming, the evaluation of these services has been almost nil. The research investigating the factors that might facilitate or impede successful placement has used the most primitive research designs. Typically retrospective, one-shot studies have been done, with investigator's asking practitioners (e.g., Hasazi, Gordon, & Roe, 1985) or clients (e.g., Kernan & Koegel, 1985) what factors influenced adjustment to vocations and other activities.

Unfortunately the comparisons made of the projects that have been funded under the recent transition education priority of the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) must be made using the same substandard evaluation designs that have become standard in recent years. Definitive answers are unlikely. It is with this misgiving that the "meta-analyses" performed by the Transition Institute have been undertaken. These analyses have necessarily departed from the model that was described above, since comparison groups are nonexistent. In order to combine the information from the many projects funded by OSERS as transition education demonstrations, several strategies have been adopted (see the Management Plan, Section A, above).

While these analyses are undermined by the practical limits of field research, it is expected that they will reveal much new information regarding the environmental conditions, program features, and personal characteristics that optimize the success of vocational placements for handicapped youth who are in transition from school to the community.

C. Classify Projects Using the Proposal Classification Form

A major activity of Task 6.2 was to perform a meta-analysis by project groups. A "proposal classification form" was initially developed for the purpose of grouping projects (i.e., establishing dependent and independent variables) for this meta-analysis. Section C describes the classification form, the frequency with which projects fell into the various categories on the form, and the benefits that have been derived by this sub-component of objective 6.2.4.

Method

The "proposal classification form" categorized projects in terms of their agency type, project objectives, number of clients, client age, client type, community type, training setting, and timing of training. As implied by the title of the form, projects were categorized solely on the basis of information given in the proposal.

A blank classification form follows as Attachment C1. The form consisted of several sections, which were completed by project staff.

1. Information regarding project identification (i.e., title, proposal numbers, city, county, and state, agency type, number of clients, and community type) was obtained directly from the proposal cover sheet.

2. Checklist of project objectives explicitly stated in the objective section of the proposal.

3. Client age (21 or younger, over 21), client type (e.g., mild mental retardation, learning disability), location of training (e.g., school, workshop), and timing of training (i.e., pre- or post-placement)--information obtained primarily from the method section of the proposal.

Forms were completed by seven evaluation program staff members. Proposals were selected unsystematically for completion. A total of 20

proposals, unsystematically selected, were rated by two different individuals. Agreement statistics were based on these 20.

Results

Frequencies for the various categories of The Proposal Classification Form are presented in Table C1.

Agency type. The grantee for most projects (41 of the 105 examined proposals) was found to be a university. Other grantee agencies were found to include community not-for-profit agencies, state education or rehabilitation facilities, schools, and one community college.

Project objectives. The three most frequently cited objectives (over 50 of the projects for each) were information dissemination, vocational training of students, and interagency planning and/or coordination. Thirty or more projects listed student placement, student pre-placement assessment, nonvocational training of students, and product development as objectives. Other reported objectives included follow-up support, technical assistance, student referral, and family training.

Student age. A total of 97 projects reported serving students that were 21 or younger. A total of 46 reported serving students over 21 years of age.

Student type. The most frequently reported student classifications were learning disability (42) and either moderate/severe mental retardation (27) or mental retardation (27). Other classifications included emotional handicap (17), physical handicap (17), sensory handicap (12), multiple handicap (12), communication disorder (2), and "at risk" (2).

Insert Table C1 about here

Table C1

Transition Institute Proposal Classification

*

I. Competition (CFDA#)

84.023D	12	84.023G	15
84.078B	15	84.078C	14
84.128A	5	84.158A	16
84.158B	11	85.158C	17

TOTAL	8 COMPETITIONS	105 PROPOSALS

[a]II. Agency Type (0=does not apply, 1=grantee, 2=secondary)

	0	1	2
1. school	90	12	3
2. community college	104	1	0
3. university	60	41	4
4. state ed. or rehabilitation facility	90	13	2
5. community workshop	105	0	0
6. community ed. or rehabilitation facility	100	2	3
7. other community not-for-profit agency	89	14	2
8. profit-making agency	105	0	0
9. several cooperating agencies	98	0	7
[b]10. other	79	21	
11. unknown	105	0	

Table C1 (continued)

III. Project Objectives enumerated in proposal ("Choose all that apply.") ("0" = No; "1" = yes)

	0	1
1. student referral	88	15
2. student pre-placement assessment	64	33
3. student placement	68	36
4. student training-voc.	39	62
5. student training-non-vocational	70	31
6. technical assistance	79	22
7. inter-agency planning and/or coordination	43	55
5. community workshop	105	0
8. product development	68	30
9. follow-up support	77	25
10. family training	85	13
11. info. dissemination	33	63
12. other	50	54
13. unknown	104	1

IV. Student Age (0=Yes; 1=No) ("Choose all that apply")

	0	1
1. 21 or younger	8	97
2. over 21	59	46

V. Student Type (0=Yes; 1=No) ("Choose all that apply")

	0	1
1. moderately and severely	78	27
2. mentally retarded	78	27
3. learning disabled	63	42
4. emotionally handicapped	88	17
5. "at risk"	103	2
6. physically handicapped	88	17
7. sensorily handicapped	93	12
8. communication disordered	103	2
9. multiply handicapped	93	12
10. all or most types	94	11
11. other	60	45
12. unknown	104	1

Table C1 (continued)

VI. Type of Community or Area Served (Choose one only) ("Choose one")

1.	metropolitan	27
2.	suburb	6
3.	small town (5000-100000)	1
4.	county	12
5.	region	17
6.	statewide	22
7.	other	13
8.	unknown	5

VII. Location of Training ("Choose all that apply")

1.	school	58
2.	workshop	9
3.	OJT	46
4.	other	14
5.	no training	21
6.	unknown	2

VIII. Timing and Training ("Choose all that apply")

1.	preplacement	55
2.	postplacement	47
3.	no training	20
4.	other	11
5.	unknown	3

---

[a]Note: Unless otherwise indicated, proposals were counted under all categories that applied to them, so the count in each of the VIII classification areas usually exceeds 105.

[b]These 21 were primarily four-year colleges and non-profit community agencies.

Area served. Projects were found to serve a variety of areas. A number reported serving entire states (22), regions (17), or counties (17). A total of 27 stated that they serve metropolitan areas, 6 stated that they served suburban areas, and 1 stated that it served a small town.

Location of training. Most training sites were found to be schools (58) or on-the-job sites (46). Nine projects were located in workshops.

Timing of training. About half the projects had training before placement (55) and about half (47) had training after placement. Twenty projects appeared to have no training.

Reliability.

Twenty proposals were randomly selected for rating by two raters. All items within each category except "number of clients" were scored dichotomously as being rated present/absent by each rater. Interrater agreement on the presence/absence of each item was then assessed. For "number of clients," agreement on the specific number of clients impacted was assessed. Both percent agreements and Kappas were then calculated to determine inter-rater reliability. Percent agreement is calculated by dividing agreements by the sum of the agreements and disagreements. Kappa is calculated by the formula, $K=(A-E)/(N-E)$, where A = agreements, E = expected agreements by chance, and N = number of items. Kappa, described by Cohen (1960), corrects the chance agreement among raters.

Although percent agreements were often acceptable (30 of 45 items had percent agreements of 80% or higher), Kappas were acceptable only about half of the time (22 of 45 items had Kappas of .60 or more). However, ratings for some categories were more reliable than ratings for others (see Table C2).

Insert Table C2 about here

There was a Kappa of 1.0 (total agreement) for number of clients and .56 (approaching acceptability) for client age. However, it may be that some disagreements were avoided in these areas as they were often left uncoded (perhaps when the information was not readily available on the cover sheet or required inference).

Type of agency and client disability also had fairly high inter-rater reliability, with all but a few items at Kappas of .60 or above. There was low agreement regarding categorization of agencies as "community education" or "rehabilitation" facilities and "other community nonprofit" as well as categorization of disability types as "at-risk," "sensory handicap," "multiple handicap," or "all or most types." The reliability for objective type was acceptable in about half of the cases. Low agreement was found for client placement, vocational training, nonvocational training, technical assistance, and information dissemination.

There was poor agreement regarding the assignment of projects to the categories within "Area served," "Location of training," and "timing of training."

In summary, reliability was generally acceptable for "number of clients," "client age," "type of agency," and "client disability." Reliability for "objective type" was often acceptable. Reliability for both "area served" and "location of training" were each acceptable for only one item; reliability for timing of training was unacceptable for all items.

Table C.2.

Reliability of Proposal Classification Form Ratings.

Category	Item #	Description	Number of Cases	Percent Agreement	Kappa
Type of Agency	D1	School	19	95	.85
	D2	Community college	19	100	1.00
	D3	University	19	84	.66
	D4	State education or rehabilitation agency	19	95	.77
	D5	Community workshop	19	100	1.00
	D6	Community education or rehabilitation agency	19	95	.00*
	D7	Other community nonprofit	19	84	-.08*
	D8	Profit-making agency	19	100	1.00
	D9	Several cooperating agencies	19	100	1.00
Objective	E1	Client referral	19	100	1.00
	E2	Client pre-placement assessment	19	68	.65
	E3	Client placement	19	68	.33*
	E4	Client training-vocational	19	68	.38*
	E5	Client training-nonvocational	19	68	.20*
	E6	Technical assistance	19	75	-.14*
	E7	Interagency planning/ coordination	19	84	.68
	E8	Product Development	19	89	.76
	E9	Follow-up support	19	84	.62
	E10	Family training	19	95	.64
	E11	Information dissemination	19	58	.16*
Number of Clients	F		15	100	1.00
Age	G1	21 or younger vs. all ages	15	80	.57
(There were no projects with only students over 21 among those randomly selected for reliability assessment.)					
Client disability type	H1	Moderate and severe mental retardation	19	84	.64
	H2	Mild mental retardation	19	85	.65
	H3	Learning disability	19	84	.67
	H4	Emotional handicap	19	95	.83
	H5	"at risk"	19	95	0.00*
	H6	Physical handicap	19	89	.68
	H7	Sensory handicap	19	95	0.00*
	H8	Communication disorder	19	100	1.00
	H9	Multiple handicap	19	84	.31*
	H10	All or most types	19	79	.37*

Category	Item #	Description	Number of Cases	Percent Agreement	Kappa
Area served	I1	Metropolitan area	18	61	.16*
	I2	Suburb	18	89	0.00*
	I3	Small town	18	100	1.00
	I4	County	18	78	.20*
	I5	Region	18	72	-.15*
	I6	Statewide	18	72	-.10*
Location of training	J1	School	18	67	.31*
	J2	Workshop	18	100	1.00
	J3	On-the-job training	18	95	-.44*
Timing of training	K1	Preplacement	19	53	.03*
	K2	Postplacement	19	58	.16
	K3	No training	19	79	0.00*

*=unacceptable Kappa of .60 or less.

Discussion

In summary, a variety of objectives have been established in a variety of settings and with a variety of students. Training, inter-agency coordination, and information dissemination are frequent goals. A large percentage of the project grantees are universities. Most often students are 21 or younger with mental retardation or learning disabilities. Training sites are fairly equally split between schools and actual job sites with some workshops. Areas of impact are most often metropolitan. However, the primary characteristic of the projects is diversity.

Although subsequent correspondence with the various project directors has indicated that the proposals themselves do not represent the most up-to-date and accurate information regarding the projects, the proposal classification forms have served at least two purposes:

1. They have provided an orientation to the projects. For example, they have assisted in establishing appropriate questions for subsequent questionnaires.

2. They provided the most comprehensive initial picture of the proposed projects. They thus give an account of initial intentions that may be later compared with actual actions and outcomes.

3. They provide a classification screen, so that questionnaire mailings can be limited to the projects that are appropriately addressed by them.

Attachment C1.

Transition Institute Proposal Classification Form
October 14, 1986

Directions: Complete all blanks and circle the numbers that indicate your choices. RECORD YOUR ACTION BOTH ON THE CLASSIFICATION RECORD NEAR THE PROPOSAL BOXES AND ON THE INSIDE REAR OF THE PROPOSAL FOLDER.

A. Title of proposal: _____

B. Competition (CFDA) # _____ OSERS Proposal # _____ TI Proposal # _____

C. City _____ County _____ State _____

D. Agency type (0=does not apply, 1=grantee, 2=secondary)

0 1 2 1. school
0 1 2 2. community college
0 1 2 3. university
0 1 2 4. state education or rehabilitation facility
0 1 2 5. community workshop
0 1 2 6. community education or rehabilit§tion facility
0 1 2 7. other community not-for-profit agency
0 1 2 8. profit-making agency
0 1 2 9. several cooperating agencies
0 1 2 10. other (specify) _____
0 1 2 11. unknown

E. Project objectives (rate 0, 1, or 2)*

0 1 2 1. client referral
0 1 2 2. client pre-placement assessment
0 1 2 3. client placement
0 1 2 4. client training - vocational
0 1 2 5. client training - non-vocational
0 1 2 6. technical assistance and
0 1 2 7. inter-agency planning and/or coordination
0 1 2 8. product development
0 1 2 9. follow-up support
0 1 2 10. family training
0 1 2 11. information dissemination
0 1 2 12. other (specify) _____
13. unknown

F. Number of clients _____

F. Client age (choose all that apply):
1. 21 or younger
2. over 21

*Use the following code: 0=does not apply; 1=explicit objective in proposal; 2=clearly implied objective in proposal.

H. Client type (choose all that apply):
1. moderately and severely mentally retarded
2. mildly mental retarded
3. learning disabled
4. emotionally handicapped
5. "at risk"
6. physically handicapped
7. sensorily handicapped
8. communication disordered
9. multiply handicapped
10. all or most types
11. other (specify) _____
12. unknown

I. Type of community or area served (Choose one only):
1. metropolitan area
2. suburb
3. small town (5000-100000)
4. county
5. region
6. statewide
7. other (specify) _____
8. unknown

J. Location of training (Choose all that apply):
1. school
2. workshop
3. OJT (on the job training)
4. other (specify) _____
5. no training
6. unknown

K. Timing of training (Choose all that apply
1. preplacement
2. postplacement
3. no training
4. other (specify) _____
5. unknown

D. Classify Projects Using The Project Characteristics Questionnaire

Successful placement is apparently affected by many factors, including some associated with training and placement agencies. One approach being taken to identify the variables associated with successful placement in employment is to ask agencies to describe their training and placement procedures and give objective data regarding their success in placing handicapped youths into competitive employment. To implement this approach, the meta-analysis staff developed the Project Characteristics Questionnaire.

Method

In May, 1986, Project Characteristics Questionnaires were mailed to the 50 of the 103 projects on the Transition Institute's roster of transition service projects who had indicated on an earlier questionnaire that they actually place students into competitive employment. The Project Characteristics Questionnaire and its instructions appear as an attachment in April, 1986, monthly report and as appendix D1 below. Questions A, B, and C asked for identifying information. Question D focuses on agency type. Respondents define their agencies by selecting "all that apply" from a list of 15 agency types. Question E asks the respondent to check which, if any, of 20 objectives are a) written in project manuals or the project's grant proposal or b) practiced but not written down. Question F asks for the classification of students by type and severity of handicap. Question G asks the respondent to check which, if any, of 11 instructional approaches is used by the project. Question H asks the respondent to check which type of community is served by the project. Question I thru L asks for features of each project's training and placement practices and results. Question M thru O asks the project to identify characteristics of

itself and its setting that facilitated or impeded successful training and placement of students.

By the time of the writing of this report 13 of the 50 had been returned. The report of this objective (6.2.4B) is based on these 13.

Results

The responses to the Project Characteristics Questionnaire are shown in Tables D1 through D3. Table D1 indicates that 6 were public or private secondary schools, 5 were universities or research institutes, and 3 were other community education or rehabilitation facilities.

Insert Table D1 about here

Six projects served metropolitan areas. One was in a rural area. Three serve an entire county and two serve a region within a state. One project served a rural area and one a suburb. None of the projects served small towns. None were statewide, nationwide, or served a region of the country.

Table D2 shows the primary objectives of the respondent projects. A list of 20 objectives was provided, and respondents were asked to indicate whether they were committed to each objective in writing. All 13 respondents indicated that student referral and information dissemination were written objectives for their projects. Twelve projects had written objectives for student preplacement assessment, student training-vocational preparation, follow-up support and/or training, interagency planning and

---

Insert Table D2 about here

Table D1

Type of Respondent Agency

Item	Agency Type	Grantee	Directly involved but as secondary agency
1	public school	5	4
2	private school	1	3
3	community or junior college	0	5
4	university or four year college	2	3
5	JTPA Service Delivery Area Agent	1	6
6	state residential education or rehabilitation facility	0	5
7	community workshop	0	6
8.	community education or rehabilitation facility	3	7
9.	profit-making agency	0	3
10.	several cooperating agencies	0	7
11.	research institute	3	0
12.	city or county government	0	6
13.	state agency	0	7
14.	other*	3	2

*Three of these were community not-for-profit agencies (cf. category 8).

Table D2

Project Objectives (Activities) of the Transition Education Projects that Place Students (N=13)

Does Not Apply	Documented Objective	Not Documented	Activity
0	13	0	student referral
0	12	1	student preplacement assessment
0	11	2	student placement
1	12	0	student training - vocational preparation
1	11	1	student training - novocational (e.g., academic, personal-social, daily living skills)
2	8	3	student counseling
0	12	1	follow-up support and/or training
2	7	4	family training or counseling
3	8	2	case management
0	13	0	information dissemination
2	6	5	technical assistance
3	5	5	inter-agency planning and/or coordination: state level
0	12	1	inter-agency planning and/or coordination: local level
3	8	2	product development
3	5	5	assessment of transition education system
0	7	6	evaluation of transition education outcomes
1	12	0	development of a model that can be replicated
10	3	0	replication of an existing transition education model
6	6	1	training professionals, paraprofessionals, or prospective educators for transition education
11	1	1	other (specify)_____
13	0	0	unknown

coordination at the local level, and development of a model that could be replicated. Eleven projects had written objectives of student placement and student training-nonvocational. All other listed objectives were selected by at least one of the 13 respondents, indicating the rich variation in the ideologies and activities of these projects. This richness will facilitate the detection of especially salient project characteristics that facilitate successful student job placement.

The 13 respondent projects indicated that they served 223 mentally retarded students, 308 learning disabled students, 128 emotionally handicapped persons, nine physically handicapped students, three students with visual impairments, and six students with hearing impairments. Fifty-five students were reported to be multiply handicapped, nine of whom were nonambulatory. These figures represent some double counting of the students served.

Respondents indicated that the most popular instructional approaches utilized for students were individualized instruction and modeling and imitation. Eleven projects used these approaches. Ten projects used task analysis, group instruction, and on-site training. Nine projects used simulations before on-site training. Six projects used peer tutoring, four use lectures, and one used "reciprocal teaching."

When they were asked about the location of students' training, eleven agencies reported that training took place on the job at a minimum wage. Nine reported that training took place in the community. Eight reported training in school. Four reported training at a workshop/rehabilitation center. Five reported "other" training options.

Six of the respondent projects provided preplacement training; ten provided postplacement (on the job) training; and one provided "no training."

Ten of the projects provided information on the number of students in various employment categories in 1985. One hundred eighty-three students were reported to be employed full- or part-time in jobs that paid above minimum wage. Five of these jobs were part-time subsidized jobs. One hundred fifty-four jobs were part-time nonsubsidized positions. Twenty-four were full-time jobs that were not subsidized. Nineteen students were reported to have part-time jobs that paid below minimum wage; thirteen of these jobs were subsidized and six were not. Three projects reported the number of students--a total of 30--that were not employed.

Insert Table D3 about here

When asked about constraints on transition education, the most common, marked in 8 proposals, was limited funding. The next most commonly reported constraint was "parents interfere with transition." Only five respondents indicated that transition education is constrained by the fact that "jobs are hard to find." Five reported "other" constraints: three indicated that transportation was a problem; the other two were lack of school administrative support and student attitudes. Four projects reported that "laws constrain placement." Four indicate that "teachers need more skills." Three respondents reported that "community attitudes interfere with placement." Two projects were constrained because housing was hard to find. Only one was constrained because employers and staff feared liability suits.

Table D3

Number of Students Employed Part or Full-time, Above or Below Minimum Wage, whose Employers Receive a Subsidy or not

	Subsidized		Nonsubsidized		
	Part-time	Full time	Part-time	Full time	Total
Above Minimum Wage	5	0	154	24	183
Below Minimum Wage	13	0	6	0	19
Total	18	0	160	24	202

Conclusion

This summary of response to the Project Characteristics Questionnaire is only preliminary. The number of responses, 13, is too low to allow conclusive statements and generalizations to be made. However, the responses already received indicate some refinements that should be made in the questionnaire. In addition, the patterns of responses suggest trends that it will be interesting to investigate. For instance, will other projects also report parent interference as a constraint to transition education? When more questionnaires have been returned, such questions can be explored. Also the relationships among reported project characteristics will be analyzed, and the characteristics that are associated with successful placement may be identified.

Attachment D1

Project Characteristics Questionnaire

April 28, 1986

DRAFT: PLEASE COMMENT

Reviewer_____Review Date_____

Secondary and Transition Institute (TI) Project
Characteristics Questionnaire
Laird W. Heal
April 28, 1986

Directions: Complete all blanks and circle the numbers that indicate your choices. Note that some lettered items permit only one choice and others permit several.

A. Title of proposal:_____

B. Competition (CFDA) #_____OSERS Proposal #_____
TI Proposal #_____

C. City _____County_____State_____Zip_____

D. Agency type (0 = does not apply, 1 = grantee, 2 = directly involved but secondary agency) (Circle all that apply.)

0	1	2	1.	public school
0	1	2	2.	private school
0	1	2	3.	community or junior college
0	1	2	4.	university or four-year college
0	1	2	5.	JTPA Service Delivery Area agent
0	1	2	6.	state residential education or rehabilitation facility (institution).
0	1	2	7.	community workshop
0	1	2	8.	community education or rehabilitation facility
0	1	2	9.	profit-making agency
0	1	2	10.	several cooperating agencies
0	1	2	11.	research institute
0	1	2	12.	city or county government
0	1	2	13.	state agency(s) (specify)
0	1	2	14.	other (specify)_____
0	1	2	15.	unknown

E. Please indicate your project objectives (i.e., primary activities) using the following codes (circle all that apply):

0 = does not apply
1 = an objective of the project that has been written down in the project proposal or in project manuals
2 = a project objective that is practiced but has not been written down

0	1	2	1.	student referral
0	1	2	2.	student preplacement assessment
0	1	2	3.	student placement
0	1	2	4.	student training - vocational preparation
0	1	2	5.	student training - nonvocational (e.g., academic, personal-social, daily living skills)
0	1	2	6.	student counseling
0	1	2	7.	follow-up support and/or training
0	1	2	8.	family training or counseling
0	1	2	9.	case management
0	1	2	10.	information dissemination
0	1	2	11.	technical assistance
0	1	2	12.	inter-agency planning and/or coordination: state level
0	1	2	13.	inter-agency planning and/or coordination: local level
0	1	2	14.	product development
0	1	2	15.	assessment of transition education system
0	1	2	16.	evaluation of transition education outcomes
0	1	2	17.	development of a model that can be replicated
0	1	2	18.	replication of an existing transition education model
0	1	2	19.	training professionals, paraprofessionals, or prospective educators for transition education
0	1	2	20.	other (specify)_____
0	1	2	21.	unknown

Comments:

F. Please enter the number of students directly served by your project during the current project year in each of the following disability categories. Count each student exactly once.

	a) moderately & severely disabled	b) mildly disabled	c) at risk
AMBULATORY STUDENTS			
1. mentally retarded	_____	_____	_____
2. learning disabled	_____	_____	_____
3. emotionally handicapped	_____	_____	_____
4. physically handicapped	_____	_____	_____
5. visually impaired	_____	_____	_____
6. auditorily impaired	_____	_____	_____
7. communication disordered	_____	_____	_____
8. multiply handicapped	_____	_____	_____
9. nonhandicapped	_____	_____	_____
10. other (specify)_____	_____	_____	_____

	a) moderately & severely disabled	b) mildly disabled	c) at risk
NONAMBULATORY STUDENTS			
11. mentally retarded	_____	_____	_____
12. learning disabled	_____	_____	_____
13. emotionally handicapped	_____	_____	_____
14. physically handicapped	_____	_____	_____
15. visually handicapped	_____	_____	_____
16. auditorily impaired	_____	_____	_____
17. communication disordered	_____	_____	_____
18. multiply handicapped	_____	_____	_____
19. other (specify)_____	_____	_____	_____
20. other (specify)_____	_____	_____	_____

Comments:

G. Instructional approaches utilized for students (choose all that apply).

1. task analysis of the skills needed for each job
2. individualized instruction
3. group instruction
4. lecture
5. modeling and imitation
6. peer tutoring
7. simulations before on-site training
8. on-site training
9. reciprocal teaching (students take turns as teachers)
10. no training
11. other (specify)_____

Comments:

H. Type of community or area served by the demonstration project (Check one only):

1. metropolitan area (Public transportation systems)
2. suburb
3. small town (5,000-100,000 with no city transportation system)
4. rural area
5. entire county
6. region within a state (including several counties)
7. statewide
8. region of nation
9. nationwide
10. other (specify)_____

Comments:

I. Location of students' training (Circle all that apply):

1. school
2. workshop/rehabilitation center
3. "on the job" at a minimum wage job
4. community
5. at home
6. college or community junior college
7. other (specify)_____
8. no training

Comments:

J. Timing of students' training (Choose all that apply):

1. preplacement
2. postplacement (on the job)
3. no training
4. other (specify)_____

Comments:

K. Indicate the number of your students who are in each of the following nine employment categories during 1985.

Employment Category	No. of students
Above minimum wage	
Subsidized (Employer may pay part of wage)	
Part-time	____
Full-time	____
Not subsidized (Employer pays entire wage)	
Part-time	____
Full-time	____
Below minimum wage	
Subsidized (Employer may pay part of wage)	
Part-time	____
Full-time	____
Not subsidized (Employer pays entire wage)	
Part-time	____
Full-time	____
Not employed	____
TOTAL	____

L. Did you place any students in 1984?_____ Approximately (within 20%) how many students did you place in 1984?_____

Comments:

M. What constrains transition education for your project? (Circle all that apply.)

1. laws constrain placement
2. funding is limited
3. teachers need more skills
4. housing is hard to find
5. jobs are hard to find
6. parents interfere with transition
7. community attitudes interfere with placement
8. employers and project staff fear liability suits
9. other (specify)_____
10. other (specify)_____

Comments:

N. What helps transition education for your project? (Check all that apply.)

1. current federal priorities
2. skilled teachers
3. workshops in the area
4. community leader who catalyzes interest
5. Parent support
6. other (specify)_____

Comments

O. How did each placed student find "their" job? (Circle one)

1. continuation of school or agency placement
2. school or agency placement upon school termination
3. parents
4. friends
5. student responded to newspaper ad
6. placement by an adult placement agency
7. other (specify) _____

Comments:

Code Students by Number	How Job Was Found (Use codes from immediately above)
1	_____
2	_____
3	_____
4	_____
5	_____
6	_____
7	_____
8	_____
9	_____
10	_____
11	_____
12	_____
13	_____

E. Collect and Review of Initial Annual Progress (evaluation) Reports

Objective 6.2.1 of the meta analysis was to review and aggregate the information from the annual progress reports of OSERS-funded transition education projects. The results of this aggregation are reported here.

Method

Of the 105 OSERS projects receiving funding during 1985-1986, 56 had original and continuation proposals arrive at the Transition Institute as of June 15, 1986. These requests were generally for a third year of funding but some were for a second year.

To determine the effectiveness with which the various transition projects are facilitating transition, it seemed best to frame the question in terms of whether they were "meeting their contracts": i.e., completing objectives that they had reported in their initial proposal for the project year being considered. To be consistent across projects, only the project year immediately prior to the project year for which funding was being requested was examined. Each of the 56 projects with a continuation request was examined in six steps. Each step featured a standard that had to be met before successive standards could be considered.

1. Listing of objectives in the original proposal--A listing of major objectives in the objectives/goals in the original proposal for the project year preceding the project year for which funding was being requested was seen as the first step in the accomplishment of these goals.

   a. Only enumerated "objectives" or "goals" were used as "major objectives or goals." "Activities" and "purposes" were also used in the project proposals, but items under either of these headings were not considered "major objectives or goals."

b. Objectives or goals that were described and organized vaguely in paragraphs so that they were difficult to identify were not considered.

c. If one overall objective or goal with enumerated subcomponents was given, each subcomponent was considered to be a "major objective or goal" for the remaining items. If more than one overall objective or goal were given, the subcomponents were not considered to be "major objectives or goals."

d. If there was (a) no indication of when any of the major objectives or goals were to be completed or (b) only a listing of those to be completed in the first project year for a project requesting third year funds, the proposal was searched for an activity timeline. An activity timeline was considered an acceptable indication of the extent to which the objectives or goals were to be completed if it gave at least one activity directly related to each objective for the project year preceding the project year to be funded. For example, 'printing a brochure' would have been considered directly linked to a dissemination objective and "hiring staff for a second training site" would have been considered directly linked to a replication objective.

2. Listing of objectives in the continuation proposal. In addition to an explicit enumeration of the objectives or goals in the original proposal (Standard #1), the requirement was set that there be a listing of major objectives or goals in the continuation proposal for the project year preceding the project year for which funding was being requested. Points a through d under item 1 were all followed.

3. Continuity of objectives from original to continuation proposal. Correspondence between the two sets of objectives or goals in numbers 1 and 2 above was determined by at least one project staff rater. Trivial changes (e.g., wording or ordering) were ignored as long as the meanings remained in correspondence. Also, the addition of new objectives in the continuation proposal did not affect correspondence judgments.

4. Description of accomplishments. The continuation proposal was then searched for a description of accomplishments showing clearly which of the objectives from step 2 were being discussed. A change in ordering was tolerated. Prose presentation of accomplishments without some separation (e.g., headings) between objectives was considered to be unclear.

5. At least one objective reached. The description of accomplishments was searched for a report indicating that at least one of the objectives from step 1 had been reached.

   a. Anticipation that an objective would be completed by the end of the project year did not count as a report of completion of that objective.

   b. For objectives that had subcomponents or an activity listing, each subcomponent or activity had to be reported as completed in order for the objective itself to be rated as being reported to be complete.

   c. For objectives involving only initiation of an activity or ongoing activity, only initiation or continuation was required, respectively, to count them as being reached.

   d. Ongoing objectives needed only to be reported as "occurring-to-date" to be counted as being reported to be reached.

6. All objectives reached. The report was checked to see if all of the objectives from Standard 1 had been reached.

A second person rated the proposals in order to assess the inter-rater reliability of the ratings. Proposals were selected unsystematically within competitions for these ratings. Proposals were taken randomly in turn from each competition until a total of eight proposals were rated on standard 6 (above). Prior to this reliability assessment, the two raters checked five practice proposals for agreement. These five proposals were not used for the reliability analyses reported below.

Both a percent agreement and a Kappa were calculated to determine the reliability of all six standards in succession. The Kappa for each successive standard was based on the cases that both raters agreed had passed the previous standard. Percent agreement (PA) was calculated by dividing the number of agreements by the sum of the agreements and disagreements. Kappa was calculated by use of the following formula:

$$K = \frac{A - E}{N - E}$$

where K = Kappa, A = agreements, E = expected agreements by chance, and N = number of items (See Cohen, 1960). The Kappa formula corrects for chance agreement, which inflates the conventional PA statistic.

Results

The number and percentage of proposals meeting each of the standards are presented in Table E1.

Insert Table E1 about here

A total of 54 project proposals were reviewed. Of this total, 39 (72%) listed objectives in the original proposal in accordance with Standard 1. Of the 39 with objectives in the original proposal, 23 (59%) Table E1

Table E1

Summary of Continuation Proposal Review Findings.

Standards	Number	%	[d]% of those at step
0. Projects for which both an original proposal and a continuation proposal were on file at the Transition Institute as of 6/15/86.	a54	(100%)	(100%)
1. Projects reporting objectives for the project year prior to that for which funding was being requested in the original proposal.	[b]39	72%	72%
2. Projects meeting Standard 1 and also reporting objectives for the project year prior to that for which funding was being requested in the continuation proposal.	23	42%	59%
3. Projects for which Standards 1 and 2 are met and for which the two sets of objectives (original versus continuation) correspond in meaning.	17	31%	74%
4. Projects for which Standards 1 through 3 are met and for which accomplishments are listed in a fashion such that they clearly indicate which of the objectives (from the original proposal, as determined in Standard 2) are being discussed.	[c]13	24%	76%

Table E1 (continued)

Standards	Number	%	[d]% of those at step
5. Projects for which at least one objective (from the original proposal, as determined in Standard 2) was reported to have been reached.	[c]8	15%	62%
6. Projects for which all objectives (from the original proposal, as determined in Standard 2) were reported to have been reached.	1	2%	13%

[a] A total of 105 proposals were on file at the Transition Institute as of June 15, 1986. However, because those not having both continuation and original proposals were excluded from this review, only 56 projects were available here. Additionally, two of these projects were missing the pages on which the original objectives were listed and were consequently excluded from the entire review. Therefore, the 100% figure is based on only the 54 proposals that were reviewed for at least the second standard.

[b] Two of the projects were excluded for this step (and all subsequent steps) as a result of missing pages that made it impossible to determine whether they met this standard.

[c] One project was excluded from step 5 (and all subsequent steps) and one was excluded from step 6 because of missing pages that made it impossible to determine whether these standards were met.

[d] Percent of those proposals that passed each step given that they had passed the immediately prior standard and were thereby eligible for consideration at the indicated step.

listed objectives in the continuation proposal in accordance with Standard 2. This represented 42% of the 54 total proposals. Of the 23 listing objectives in both the original and continuation proposals, 17 (74%) had a correspondence between the two lists. This represented 31% of the 54 total proposals. Of the 17 with corresponding lists of objectives in the original and continuation proposals, 13 (76%) had a listing of accomplishments that was clearly linked with the objectives in the original proposal. This represented 24% of the 54 total proposals. Of the 13 with accomplishments that were clearly linked to the objectives in the original proposal, 8 (62%) reported completion of at least one objective. This represented 15% of the 54 total proposals. Of the 8 that reported reaching at least one objective, 1 (13%) reported reaching all objectives. This represented 2% of the 54 total proposals.

The results of the reliability assessment are shown in Table E2. Although two of the percent agreements are acceptable (at or above 80%), none of the Kappas (which correct for chance levels of responding) even approach acceptability (at or above .60). Thus the ratings reported in Table E2 are not reliably different from those that would result from a random (coin-toss) selection of proposals meeting successive standards.

Insert Table E2 about here

Because of the poor inter-rater reliability five proposals were selected unsystematically and examined to determine the reasons for the disagreements. Based on this review, it appeared that the second rater's scoring was more accurate. This rater then reviewed the remainder of the proposals, and the second rater's scores were used for the results reported above.

Table E2

Results of Reliability Assessment of Continuation Proposal Review

Standard	% Agreement[a]	Kappa[b]	N
2. Objectives listed in original proposal.	61%	.15	46
3. Objectives listed in continuation proposal.	76%	.35	21
4. Correspondence between original and continuation objectives.	79%	.28	14
5. Clear linkage between discussion of accomplishments and original objectives.	90%	0	10
6. Reported completion of at least one objective.	67%	0	9
7. Reported completion of all objectives.	83%	0	6

[a] % agreement = agreements/(agreements + disagreements)

[b] $K = \frac{\text{(agreements - agreements expected by chance)}}{\text{(number of cases - agreements expected by chance)}}$

Discussion

Several points are apparent upon examination of Table E1.

1. A surprisingly high number (28%) of the proposals did not list objectives for the project year preceding that for which the continuation request was being made. Partially this was a result of the fact that most of these were requests for third-year funding and some proposal writers were reluctant to write specific objectives for the second year in the original proposal. However, the absence of objectives in the initial proposal made it impossible to determine whether the projects were effective in achieving what they had intended to achieve.

2. The number of projects that listed objectives in their original proposal but did not list corresponding objectives in their continuation proposal (either because of the absence of an objective list in the continuation proposal or a lack of correspondence between the objectives) was again surprisingly large (22 of 39). This again hindered determination of whether projects met their initial objectives.

3. Projects with corresponding objective lists in their original and continuation proposals usually (76%) listed accomplishments in a way that made it fairly easy to identify which objectives were being discussed. However, anecdotally, it had seemed that overall (in all 54 proposals) accomplishments were too frequently presented in a format that interfered with interpretation (e.g., unordered and intermixed within a single subsection, simply entitled accomplishments).

4. At first glance it appears that projects often not successful in completing their objectives (only 1 of 13 with corresponding objectives and clear listings of accomplishments completed all initially stated objectives). However, this low completion rate was understandable in view of

the fact that continuation proposals were often required after only 2 or 3 months into the project year for which the objectives were listed. In light of this early submission, the fact that 62% of those with corresponding objectives and clear listings of accomplishments had completed at least one objective is commendable.

5. Although the reason for the poor reliability obtained for this review is unclear, it would appear that proposal guidelines requiring Standards 1 through 4 (corresponding listings of objectives in original and continuation proposals, and a list of accomplishments in the latter) would enhance an outsider's ability to determine what a given project expected to achieve and what it in fact did achieve.

In summary, the projects appear to be progressing toward their objectives at a rate consistent with their proposed timelines, based on the evidence that can be gleaned from the proposals themselves. Two major recommendations that would clarify whether progress is occurring at desired rates are (a) guidelines requiring standards 1 through 4 and (b) submission of progress information at the close of each year of funding.

F. Compare Case Studies of Successful and Unsuccessful Job Placements

This section reports the results to date of the case study meta-analysis project. The case study project has been undertaken to identify variables that influence success or lack of success in transition from secondary school to competitive employment and independent adult living.

Method

Each project director was queried about participating in the case study project. Those who expressed an interest in doing the case studies were sent a packet containing instructions and a "case study checklist." Both are shown in Attachment F1.

The project director was asked to select one student whose vocational placement was successful and one whose placement was unsuccessful. "Success" was defined as paid employment for at least 10 hours a week at minimum wage or better, funded by the employer, and lasting at least six months. The subjects selected were to be as similar as possible on the variables of age, sex, race, and ability level. The reason for matching the subjects on those variables was to control for the influence such variables might have on the outcome of the placements. Each case study was to be written by someone who knew the subject well.

The Case Study Checklist was intended to provide guidelines regarding the information desired, and to ensure that as many variables as possible would be addressed by the respondents. The Checklist has five sections. Section A focuses on student characteristics. Section B examines environmental factors including the home environment, and various characteristics of the community. Section C looks at training programs. Section D looks at the broader perspectives of support for vocational placements, economic incentives, evidence that the student achieved greater independence, and

the effects of governmental actions and policies. Finally, section E requests a summary of the story of the placement.

Results

At the time that this report was prepared, five pairs of students had been described in case studies. Each pair consisted of a student whose vocational placement was successful and one whose placement was not successful. The results are reported below. For ease of comparison, all tables are arranged so that the information for the successful and unsuccessful students in each pair is presented together. Throughout this paper, the terms "successful" and "unsuccessful" are used to refer to the outcome of the vocational placement and are not intended to reflect academic achievement or, indeed, any other areas of their lives.

Characteristics of the students are shown in Table F1.

Table F1 about here

Table F1 shows the characteristics on which students were matched: age, sex, race, and primary disability. It also shows the last grade or grade equivalent completed, and each student's school placement history. The table shows clearly that the students were well-matched on these characteristics.

Table F2 shows the primary disability and the presence or absence of physical or medical conditions that might limit independence.

Table F1

Summary of Student Characteristics

	S/U	Pair Number: 1	2	3	4	5
Age	S	18	22	19	19	22
	U	18	22	20	19	20
Sex	S	M	M	M	M	F
	U	M	M	M	M	F
Ethnicity of home	S	B	W	W	B/I	W
	U	B	W	W	W	W
Primary Disability	S	MR	MR	MR	MR	MI
	U	MR	MR	MR	MR	MI
Last grade completed	S	11	12	12	12	12
	U	11	12	12	12	12
Years in regular class	S	2	0	1	NA	1
	U	1	0	0	3	0
Years in regular class with support	S	0	1	0	NA	7
	U	0	7	0	5	0
Years in special class	S	10	13	12	NA	0
	U	13	8	9	3	2
Years in special school	S	1	0	0	NA	1.5
	U	0	0	2	1	2
Years in residential school	S	0	0	0	NA	4
	U	0	0	0	0	4

S = Successful
U = Unsuccessful
B/I = mixed Black and Indian
NA = not available
MR = Mentally Retarded
MI = Mentally Ill

Table F2 about here

Three students are reported to have some physical limitations. Occasional substance abuse by two of the unsuccessful students is reported in the case studies. The employment history of the students is shown in Table F3.

Table F3 about here

The number of placements reported for successful and unsuccessful students is similar. Wages, with one exception, were at least the legal minimum. All jobs were entry-level positions. The important difference for successful and unsuccessful students is the length of time in each placement.

In addition to information about student characteristics, information about environmental influences was requested. Table F4 presents a summary of information about the students' current living arrangement.

Table F4 about here

Five of the students live with their parents, two in apartments, two in group homes, and one with his grandmother. Information about the number of residents and number of rooms was not provided in some of the case studies. No striking differences between successful and unsuccessful cases are noticeable based on the information provided.

Table F2

Physical or Medical Conditions That Might Limit Independence

	1	2	3	4	5
Successful	No	Yes*	Yes**	No	No
Unsuccessful	No	No	Yes***	[a]No	[b]No

*Mild conductive hearing loss
**Limited R arm, weak visual percept.
***mild spastic cerebral palsy

[a]experiments with drugs infrequently

[b]occasional alcohol abuse

Table F3

Employment Histories

Successful Work Placements

Student Pair	Job Title	Hourly Wage	Year(s) or Length of Time Employed
1	Kitchen Assistant	3.50	1 year
2	Dishwasher/Bus boy	3.35	1983
	Dishwasher	3.35	1983-85
	Sandwich Maker/Dish	3.35	1984-85
	Dishwasher/bus boy	4.25	1985-86
3	Janitor	3.35	7 weeks
	Order filler/boxmaker	3.60	10 months
4	Tire changer	3.60	1 yr./currently
	Courtesy clerk	3.35	1 year
	Custodian	3.35	3 months
5	Wrap merchandise	3.35	5 months
	Janitorial	4.00	3 months
	Messenger	4.00	8 months
	Maxicare	4.00	2 months
	Microfilm Trainee	3.85	1 1/2 months

Unsuccessful Work Placements

1	Pizza preparation	3.35	1985
2	Laundry worker	3.60	9-1983
	Dishwasher	1.08	1984-85
	Dishwasher	3.60	6-1985
3	Greenhouse worker	3.35	2 months
4	Custodian	3.35	1 month
	Apprentice Cabinet maker	3.35	3 months
	Truck Cap Installer	4.00	1 month
	Cook	3.35	1 month
	Bus boy/prep cook	3.35	3 months
	Job Corps	NA	2 months
5	Wrap merchandise	3.35	3 months
	Food service	3.35	2 weeks
	Food service	3.35	2 weeks

Table F4

Students' Current Living Arrangement

	Pair #				
	1	2	3	4	5
Living arrangement:					
Successful	Relative	GH[a]	Parents	Parents	Supervised Apt.
Unsuccessful	Parents	GH	Parents	Parents	Own Apt.
# of Residents:					
Successful	2	8	?	5	?
Unsuccessful	4	8	?	5	1
# of Rooms:					
Successful	3	?	?	8	?
Unsuccessful	6	?	?	10	?

[a]Note: GH = Group Home

Table F5 summarizes reports of the quality of the neighborhood in which the student lives. It appears that successful and unsuccessful students live in similar neighborhoods.

Table F5 about here

Table F6 compares the training programs of the successful and unsuccessful students. The intensity and thoroughness of the training programs for these students is striking.

Table F6 about here

In only one instance did the training programs differ. The unsuccessful student in pair 3 received training in daily living skills while the successful student did not.

Table F7 focuses on the decision-making influence of various persons or teams regarding the total training and placement program for each student. A total of 100 "influence points" were divided among the individuals or groups listed as "Sources of Influence."

Table F7 about here

Differences of 5 to 10 points in the reported influence of any person or group on the training and placement of the successful and unsuccessful students can be seen. There is no pattern that might suggest that greater or lesser amounts of input from any source affects placement outcomes.

Table F5

Table F5

Quality of Neighborhood

	Pair Numbers				
	1	2	3	4	[a]5
"ritzy"		U			
professionals		U			
middle class		S	B	B	
apartments	U	S			
blue collar	B			B	
mixed commercial	U	U			
slum					
other				B	

[a]This information was not provided for pair #5.

[b]Note: B = Both students
S = Successful student
U = Unsuccessful student

Table F6

Characteristics of Training Program

	Pair Number				
	1	2	3	4	5
personal/social skills	[a]B	B	B	B	B
daily living skills	B	-	U	-	B
career guidance & planning	B	B	B	B	B
academic skills	B	B	-	B	B
travel skills	B	-	-	B	B
job readiness skills	B	B	B	B	B
job placement	B	B	B	B	B
follow-up, long term support and supervision	B	B	B	B	B
other	-	-	B	B	-
other	-	-	B	B	-

[a]Note: B = Both students
S = Only successful student
U = Only unsuccessful student
- = Neither

Table F7

Influences in Finding Placements

Sources of Influence	[a]S/U	Pair Number 1	2	3	4	5
Intake assessment & evaluation	S	10	10	0	5	10
	U	10	5	0	5	10
Preplacement trainers and/or teachers	S	30	20	20	25	5
	U	30	15	40	20	5
Placement counselors	S	10	5	15	20	5
	U	10	5	15	25	5
OJT Trainers and/or teachers	S	20	20	15	20	30
	U	20	15	15	20	30
Supervisors of direct service staff	S	0	5	0	0	30
	U	0	10	0	0	30
Agency Board	S	0	0	0	0	0
	U	0	0	0	0	0
Parents and other family	S	20	5	20	25	10
	U	30	15	10	25	10
Friends and advocates	S	10	0	0	5	10
	U	0	0	0	5	10
Other	S	0	15	5	0	0
	U	0	20	20	0	0
Other	S	0	20	0	0	0
	U	0	15	0	0	0

[a]Note: S = Successful placement
U = Unsuccessful placement

Table F8 shows sources of support for the student's placement and how much each is believed to have contributed in support of the placement. A total of 100 "support points" was distributed among the categories listed.

Table F8 about here

If there are any trends, they are very subtle. Students' superior ability and more extensive on-the-job supervision were given more credit for supporting the placement of the successful student than of the unsuccessful student. "Enlightened leadership in transition agency," and "follow-up from transition agency" were reported as more common for unsuccessful students.

Table F9 describes economic incentives and disincentives regarding placement. Very few incentives or disincentives are reported. Students earn wages, pay taxes, and lose SSI.

Table F9 about here

Table F10 shows who pays students during the evaluation, training, and placement process.

Table F10 about here

Departments of Rehabilitative Services (DRS) provided funding for four students. Evidence that the placement helped the student achieve increased independence was requested. Table F11 summarizes the evidence.

Table F8

Source and Importance of Job Placements

Sources of Support	S/U	Pair Number 1	2	3	4	5
student's ability	S	20	20	15	50	30
	U	20	10	20	5	0
peer(s) on the job	S	20	10	0	0	0
	U	0	20	0	0	0
supervisors on the job	S	20	20	30	5	20
	U	10	5	20	5	30
follow-up from transition agency	S	20	0	15	30	30
	U	30	10	30	50	0
family support	S	20	5	30	10	0
	U	10	15	10	25	20
good judgment in student placement matchup	S	0	20	10	5	30
	U	10	5	20	5	0
luck	S	0	10	0	0	0
	U	0	10	0	0	0
enlightened leadership in job placement setting	S	0	25	0	0	0
	U	0	0	0	5	0
enlightened leadership in transition agency	S	0	0	0	0	20
	U	20	0	0	5	50
other	S	0	0	0	0	0
	U	0	25	0	0	0
other	S	0	0	0	0	0
	U	0	0	0	0	0

Table F9

Economic Incentives and Disincentives to Job Placement

Economic incentives or disincentives for:	S/U	Pair Number: 1	2	3	4	5
Student	S	wages	loss of SSI	NA	None reported	NA
	U	wages, job, trainer	loss of SSI	NA	None reported	NA
Training Staff	S	None reported	None reported	NA	None reported	NA
	U	None reported	None reported	NA	None reported	NA
Training Agency	S	funding based on placements	None reported	NA	None reported	NA
	U	"Yes"	None reported	NA	None reported	NA
Placement Site	S	None reported	TJTC	NA	Cash incentive for placement	NA
	U	TJTC, trainer, stipend paid	None reported	TJTC	Employee	NA
Funding Agency	S	None reported	None reported	NA	None reported	NA
	U	None reported	None reported	NA	None reported	NA
Taxpayers	S	None reported	Yes	NA	S is paying taxes	NA
	U	None reported	Yes	NA	S is paying taxes	NA
Others	S	None reported	None reported	NA	None reported	NA
	U	None reported	None reported	NA	None reported	NA

S = Successful, U = Unsuccessful, NA = Not answered,
TJTC = Targeted Jobs Tax Credit

Table F10

Sources of Funding for Evaluation, Training, Placement

Pair Number	Successful	Unsuccessful
1	Employer Project Workability (State Dept. of Education)	Project Workability stipend
2	Employer DRS (OJT program)	DRS (OJT money)
3	Incentive from Dept. of Rehab. Services (DRS)	Incentive from DRS
4	Employer	Employer
5	NA	NA

NA = Not answered
DRS = Department (or Division) of Rehabilitation Services

Table F11 about here

This information was not provided for one pair of case studies. Evidence was reported that the other four of the successful students had gained increased independence in the four areas of concern. Unsuccessful students showed evidence of increased independence in only two or three areas.

Discussion

The successful and unsuccessful students in the case study project were well matched on a number of variables that one would expect to expose their differences. They were remarkably similar in personal characteristics, environmental experiences, and training programs. The projects

selected well-matched subjects for their case studies. Successful and unsuccessful students in each pair differed only slightly on the personal characteristics identified in Tables 1 and 2: age, sex, ethnicity, disability, school placement history, and physical or medical conditions. The current living arrangements, shown in Table F4, were similar, and the quality of the neighborhood in which the students lived, shown in Table 5, was also very similar for each pair. The successful and unsuccessful students in each pair work in communities whose economies are based on the same industries, as shown in Table F6. Table F5 shows that attitudes toward handicapped individuals are similar in the communities where the successful and unsuccessful students live. This finding is, of course, partially spurious, since both members of most pairs presumably came from the same community. Reported economic incentives and disincentives (Table F9), and funding to pay student during evaluation, training and placement, (Table 12) are similar for both successful and unsuccessful students.

Subtle differences are noted between successful and unsuccessful students in Tables F3, F6, F7, and F11. Table F3 shows, as would be expected, the unsuccessful students were employed for a much shorter time than were the successful students. Differences in the type of job and wages were not noted, except that one unsuccessful student held a job at the substandard wage of $1.08 per hour.

In Table F7, differences in the influence attributed to various sources varies from 5 to 10 points, and in one instance by 20 points. But for most of the persons on teams listed, the same amount of influence is attributed whether the outcome is successful or unsuccessful.

Greater differences are noted in the sources of support, shown in Table F8. Student ability and on-the-job supervisors seem important when

Table F11

Evidenced of Increased Independence

	S/U	1	2	3	4	5
Educational evidence	S	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes
	U	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes
Vocational evidence	S	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes
	U	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	No
Living skills evidence	S	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes
	U	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	No
Behavior change	S	Yes	None needed	NA	Yes	Yes
	U	Yes	None needed	NA	No	No

S = Successful Student
U = Unsuccessful Student
NA = Not answered

the student is successful. The transition agency appears important when the student is unsuccessful.

In Table F11 successful students were seen by their agencies to have become more independent than were the unsuccessful students.

The differences between successful and unsuccessful students that have appeared in these tables are suggestive but not conclusive. The small number of responses to date makes it impossible to know which, if any, of the differences is meaningful. When the total complement of 50 cases is completed, summary statements can be made with more certainty.

Attachment F1

University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign

Secondary Transition Intervention
Effectiveness Institute

College of Education

110 Education Building
1310 South Sixth Street
Champaign, Illinois 61820

(217) 333-2325

(217)333-0260
(Heal)

TRANSITION INSTITUTE

CASE STUDY META-ANALYSIS

INSTRUCTIONS AND FORMAT

Laird W. Heal

April 17, 1986

The Secondary/Transition Institute at the University of Illinois has been charged by the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services to identify the factors that lead to successful transition education. This case study project will attem to identify these factors.

We are asking each model transition project funded by OSERS to help us by providing two case studies: one of a successful placement (i.e., paid employment for at least 10 hours per week at minimum wage or better funded by the employer and lasting at least six months) and one of an unsuccessful placement (i.e., one that lasts less than six months). The successful and unsuccessful cases should be matched as closely as possible on their personal characteristics (ability profile, age, sex, ethnicity, motivation, handicap profile, etc.) so that success of placement can be attributed to environmental and program characteristics rather than to personal characteristics of the student.

My staff and I will review these case studies and combine the information from about 50 different pairs of students in order to identify the features of placement and training that appear to distinguish between successful and unsuccessful placements.

Please tell the story of the student that you have chosen as accurately as you can. You have been selected to write this story because you were recognized to have special insights into this student and the targeted job. Your opinions and judgments are, therefore, at least as valuable as your knowledge of the raw facts.

In order to assist my staff and me in combining the information from so many case studies, we are asking that everyone follow the same outline. Please cover the topics listed below using the numbering system that has been provided to identify the sections of your report: (a) Please complete all checklist items, making liberal comments, adding new choices, or modifying our choices in order to make your responses as accurate as possible, and (b) write a narrative about the case in as much, or as little, detail as you please. A major purpose of the narrative is to clarify checklist responses. But even more important is to describe important aspects of the placement that the checklist does not request.

Some of the information requested by the Case Study Checklist below may be difficult for you to obtain. While we would like to have complete information on every student, we are much more interested in reading your story than we are in getting every item completed on the Checklist.

Our research guidelines require that the anonymity of each student be protected, and that no participant be coerced to participate in research involuntarily. Therefore, please use fictitious names for any student you choose to study, and tell them of their right to refuse to answer any questions that you might want to ask them. It is not considered unethical to consult project files in order to tell the story of an individual student as long as the student's anonymity is preserved.

We believe that this project will make an important contribution to our knowledge of successful transition education, and we appreciate your important contribution to it.

Laird W. Heal

University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign

Secondary Transition Intervention
Effectiveness Institute

110 Education Building
1310 South Sixth Street
Champaign, Illinois 61820

College of Education

(217) 333-2325

(217)333-0260
(Heal)

CASE STUDY CHECKLIST
Laird W. Heal
April 17, 1986

A. Student characteristics and background.

_____1. Student's age.

_____2. Student's sex.

_____3. Ethnicity of the student's home.

_____4. Last grade completed or equivalent.

5. School placements since kindergarten. (Enter year(s) and checks in the spaces below.)

Year(s)	Regular Class	Regular Class & Support	Special Class	Special School	Residential School
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

7. List all jobs held and the hourly wages of each job.

Year(s)	Job Title or DOT Code	Hourly Wage
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

8. How is this student typical of those of a similar age, sex, and overall ability, and how is he or she different? Discuss special talents or disabilities, special family or friendship situations, or job characteristics that might have affected this student's placement, making it better or worse than that of his peers.
9. Does this student have any physical or medical conditions that might limit his or her independence? List physical conditions as well as regular or occasional medications.

B. Environment and environmental history.
   1. Describe the student's home environment. Include significant information about:
      a. Parents, guardians, supervisors
      b. Siblings
      c. Number of residents
      d. Number of rooms
      e. Status, privileges, and responsibilities of the student in his or her home
   2. Quality of neighborhood (Choose all that apply.)
      a. "ritzy"
      b. professionals
      c. middle class
      d. apartments
      e. blue collar
      f. mixed commercial
      g. slum
      h. other (describe)

3. Describe the home environment of this student from birth to the present time, stressing the factors that seem to have most influenced his or her vocational development. How was the student regarded by parents, siblings, peers, and neighbors as he or she was an infant, toddler, pre-schooler, and student. Please be brief, stressing the student's preparation for employment.

4. Describe the economy of the community where the student is (was) employed. Which of the following industries appear to be more prevalent or less prevalent than they would be in the average community? Please check one choice for each industry:

Industry	Less prevalent	Average	More prevalent
Agriculture	_____	_____	_____
Manufacturing	_____	_____	_____
Retail trade	_____	_____	_____
Wholesale trade	_____	_____	_____
Government	_____	_____	_____
Service industries	_____	_____	_____
Construction	_____	_____	_____
Education	_____	_____	_____

5. Describe the attitude of this community toward handicapped students and their future life styles. Discuss vocations, residences, and leisure activities. Are there ample job opportunities for handicapped people? Are handicapped people integrated into regular apartments? Are handicapped individuals often seen in public? Focus on the features of the community that directly influence the student.

6. Describe the human service system that can be expected to support the vocational, residential, and leisure status of the student. If feasible, draw an organization chart showing the governing and cooperative relationships among the agencies responsible for this student's vocational, residential, and residential services.

C. Program characteristics

1. Our primary descriptions of your program will be the "profile" prepared by the Transition Institute Evaluation faculty under the direction of Drs. Allen Phelps and Lizanne DeStephano, and the project abstracts that appeared in your grant proposals. If you feel that these documents need expansion, please supplement them.

2. Describe the training program for this student. Which of the following program characteristics apply to the programming for this student? (Check all that apply.)

_____a. Personal and social skills

_____b. Daily living skills

_____c. Career and guidance planning

_____d. Academic skills

_____e. Travel skills

_____f. Job readiness skills

_____g. Job placement

_____h. Follow-up and long-term support and supervision.

_____i. Other (specify)

_____j. Other (specify)

3. Estimate the decision-making influence of each of the following teams or individuals regarding the total training and placement program of this student. In making this estimate, assign a total of 100 "influence points" to the following 11 "actors" in the placement process.

Influence Points	Team or Individual
_____a.	Intake assessment and evaluation team
_____b.	Pre-placement trainers and/or teachers
_____c.	Placement counselors
_____d.	On-the-job trainers and/or teachers
_____e.	Supervisors of direct service staff
_____f.	Agency Board
_____g.	Parents and other family
_____h.	Friends and advocates
_____i.	Other (specify)
_____j.	Other (specify)
100	Total (The sum of all points must equal 100)

D. Some broad perspectives

1. Assign "support points" to each of the following supports for the student's placement. What has kept this student on the job OR, in the case of an unsuccessful placement, what profile of energies was focused on the effort to keep this student on the job? Please assign 100 effort points to the 11 support categories.

Support Points	Sources of support
_____a.	student's ability
_____b.	peer(s) on the job
_____c.	supervisor(s) on the job
_____d.	follow-up from transition agency
_____e.	family support
_____f.	good judgment in student-placement match-up
_____g.	luck
_____h.	enlightened leadership in job placement setting
_____i.	enlightened leadership in transition agency
_____j.	Other (specify)
_____k.	Other (specify)
100	(The sum of all points must be 100)

2. What economic incentives or disincentives regarding placement are/were there for each of the following individuals or groups involved in this placement?

   a. the student (e.g., loss of SSI)

   b. the training staff (e.g., bonus for each placement)

c. the training agency (e.g., funding based on the number of students placed)

d. the placement site (e.g., free advertising)

e. the funding agency(s) (e.g., increased appropriations)

f. taxpayers (e.g., removal of client from SSI)

g. other (specify)

h. other (specify)

3. Who pays the student throughout the evaluation, training, and placement process?

4. What evidence is there that the student's program has helped him or her to achieve greater independence?

   a. educational evidence (e.g., improved from no coin recognition to knowing labels for all U.S. coins)

   b. vocational evidence (e.g., improved from no knowledge of dishwashers to independent operation)

   c. living skills evidence (e.g., moved from ICFDD to apartment)

   d. evidence of reduction of destructive, disruptive, or inappropriate behavior (e.g., swearing rate was reduced from one word in 10 to one in 200)

5. What actions and/or policies of local, state, and federal governments facilitated or impeded the education, and placement process of this student.

E. Summary. Tell the story of this placement in a nutshell. Write one or two sentences completing each of the following items.

1. John is _____.

2. John grew up _____.

3. John now lives _____.

4. John was selected for placement at _____ because (skills, employer compatibility, training).

5. On the job, John _____.

6. The benefits of the placement have been _____.

7. The difficulties of the placement have been _____.

8. The placement has (succeeded, failed) because _____.

G. Compare OSERS Research Projects on Transition Education

At the annual meeting in October, 1985, in Washington, D.C., the staff of the meta-analysis evaluation sub-component was urged to contact the projects that had been funded to do research on transition education.

Accordingly, objective 6.2.12--Compare OSERS research projects from competitions 84.158C (7 projects) and 84.158G (15 projects)--was added to the management plan from the original proposal when objective 6.2.3 (Develop a framework for the meta-analysis) was completed in March, 1986.

Method

A one-page questionnaire (Attachment G1) was completed for all 22 research projects from the two competitions. This was mailed to the 84.158G competition and completed by Institute staff for the 84.158C competition. Ten of the 22 questionnaires were completed by the 84.158G project staff, 6 were completed from telephone interviews with project staff, and 6 were completed solely on the basis of project abstracts. No reliability analysis was done.

Table G1 about here

Results

The results of the survey of the OSERS research competitions 84.158C and 84.158G appear in Table G1. Section A of this table shows that only 16 of the 22 projects directly served handicapped transition education students. Furthermore, (Section B) only seven of these placed students, although section D shows that an additional 5 who placed, trained, or assessed students in placements made by other agencies. Section C shows

that at least 12 of the 22 projects were documenting their research procedures, and only three have no apparent plan to do so.

Finally, section D shows the most crucial data from the survey: the cross-tabulation of the type of experimental design by the three degrees of involvement in the placement of students into competitive jobs. As noted above, only 12 projects (sum of columns 1 and 2) had interventions that directly affected student placement. Also, it is clear that none of these had randomly established control groups and only four had control groups of any kind.

Conclusion

The Transition Education service projects funded by OSERS do not lend themselves to a conventional meta-analysis. A conventional meta-analysis uses the strategy of creating a standardized measure of the difference between the success of treated and untreated subjects, that is, between experimental and control groups. Because only four of the research projects funded by OSERS employed control groups (and none had the preferred randomly assigned control group), there is little point in engaging in a conventional meta-analysis, which should have at least five times as many projects as predictor variables. Thus, objective 6.2.12 will end with this report.

Table G1

Results for the Transition Education Feasibility Survey

Funded projects from OSERS
Competitions 84.158C and 84.158G

A. Population Served

Number of Projects	
16	Developmentally Disabled Students within the 13-26 age range
6	None, indeterminate, not applicable
22	Total

B. Project activities

Number of Projects	Activity
10	Student or client pre-service assessment
15	Student or client training
7	Student or client work placement
8	On-the-job training of clients or students. Training after placement.
8	Student evaluation after placement

C. Manual to document project

Number of projects	Activity
9	Manual exists
3	Manual in preparation
3	Exact procedures not to be documented
7	Unknown
22	TOTAL

Table G1 (continued)

D. Experimental design for projects who placed or did not place students

Placement status of project			Design
Placements are made	Placements are followed but not made	Placements are not made	
0	0	0	True experiment (Random assignment to experimental and control groups
2	2	3	Intact groups (No random assignment to groups)
4	2	6	Multiple baseline: time series with intra-subject comparisons
1	1	7	Single group of students with no non-intervention condition
7	5	16	Total

Attachment G1

Transition Education Summary Analysis Feasibility Questionnaire

Laird W. Heal - February 10, 1986

1. Official Title of Project:

_____

_____

2. Project Director: _____

3. Mailing Address: _____

_____

_____

4. Telephone: _____

5. This project is funded by _____

6. Students or clients served directly: No = 0; Yes = 1

[a] 0 1 a. Young adults from 13-26
0 1 b. Developmentally disabled

7. Project activity: No = 0; Yes = 1

0 1 a. Student or client pre-service assessment
0 1 b. Student or client training
0 1 c. Student or client work placement
0 1 d. On-the-job training of clients or students
0 1 e. Student evaluation after work placement

0 1 8. Are the procedures used for the project's activities written down in a manual?

0 1 9. Does your project define a successful placement in some objective way?

0 1 10. HOW? _____

_____

_____

0 1 11. Do you have an experimental or quasi-experimental design to determine whether your project's procedures are an improvement upon the transition education program that would exist in your absence.

12. When would you respond to a request for your procedures and successful placements mentioned in items 7-9.

_____

[a]Note: Circle "0" to indicate a "No" response or "1" a "Yes" response.

H. TASK 6.2: A META-ANALYSIS OF TRANSITION EDUCATION: Year 2 Activities

August 21, 1986 - August 20, 1987

Graduate Assistant: Janell Haney

A meta-analysis is an aggregation of information from a number of primary sources. As applied in the present series, it will be an aggregation of information about successful and unsuccessful transition from secondary education to post-secondary settings--information provided by the projects that are being funded by the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

Two strategies will be applied. The first will be a conventional attempt to identify the variables associated with high rates of successful placement (Objective 6.2.4 and 6.2.13). Projects will be classified according to their goals and procedures. Variations in classification will form the independent variables of this analysis. Placement outcomes for each project will be measured. These might include proportion of graduates placed in part- or full-time employment, average wages of graduates, proportion of students placed into cooperative part-time employment, per-student program cost, etc. This analysis strategy will program characteristics that are associated with high rates of quality placements. The second meta-analysis approach will be the aggregation of information from a number of successful and unsuccessful placement cases (Objective 6.2.11). OSERS service projects are asked to nominate successful and unsuccessful placements of students from high school training programs into the competitive employment marketplace. Each project has been asked to

nominate a typical successful case and a typical unsuccessful case. The reasons for success or failure will be noted in a case study that will be completed according to a structured format. This format will yield both objective and subjective information about these cases. Here the individual will be the unit of analysis, and the effort will be to identify individual characteristics, training programs, and placement situations that maximize placement quality and minimize placement failure.

The first year of the project has focused on sharpening the measurement instruments and instructions to individual projects and identifying the data that are widely available over many projects. A preliminary report of this work, including tentative findings, will appear in the first annual report. The analysis and reporting of this pilot work will be completed by January of 1987. In the meantime, instruments and instructions will be fine-tuned, and both meta-analyses will be repeated in the winter of 1987. A final report of these meta-analyses should be ready for the second annual report in the summer of 1987.

It is difficult to see beyond the summer of 1987, but it would probably be valuable to continue to aggregate data, realizing the cooperating service projects will improve their data recording procedures year by year, and the institute will improve its instruments, instructions, and analyses.

Procedures

6.2.13 (Year 2 of 6.2.4 - Meta-analysis by Project Groups). Responses from the questionnaire mailed in the last week of May, 1986, will be tabulated and analyzed using the IBM statistical package, SAS. Multivariate least squares statistical procedures will be used

to indicate the project characteristics that appear to be related to high rates of quality placements. These results will be written in a preliminary report for the Institute's annual meeting in October, 1987. After review by the Institute Advisory Board and the OSERS project officer, a final report will be completed and disseminated in January, 1987. The questionnaire will be revised and the projects will be asked to complete it in the early spring of 1987. Sufficient numbers should be returned by June, 1987, to allow a preliminary report of the results to be included in the 1987 annual report.

6.2.12. (Meta-analysis of Case Studies). Responses from the Case Study Guidelines mailed to projects on April 21, 1986, will be analyzed using a content analysis coding system to be developed by project staff in the summer of 1986. Multivariate least squares statistical procedures from the IBM SAS statistical package will be used to indicate which personal, employment, training, and supervisor characteristics appear to be associated with successful and unsuccessful job placement. A preliminary report will be prepared for the annual meeting in October, 1987. After review by the Institute Advisory Board and the OSERS project officer, a final report will be completed and disseminated in February, 1987. The Case Study guidelines will be amended and projects will be asked to continue to complete case studies on matched pairs of successfully and unsuccessfully placed pairs of handicapped students. New cases will be added to the analyses and a final report of all aggregated cases will be prepared for the annual report in July, 1987.

Products

The products will be two major reports. each with one or two preliminary drafts. Each one will be submitted for publication in a scholarly journal. The production schedule is detailed as in the management plan and timetable immediately below.

I. References

Bangert-Drowns, R. L. (1984). Developments in meta-analysis: A review of five methods (Report No. 36). Ann Arbor, Michigan: Michigan University, Center for Research on Learning and Teaching.

Cobb, H. V. (1972). The Forecast of Fulfillment: A Review of Research on Predictive Assessment of the Adult Retarded for Social and Vocational Adjustment. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cohen, J. (1960). A Coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 20, 37-46.

Conley, R. W. (1973). The Economics of Mental Retardation. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Glass, G. V., McGaw, B., & Smith, M. L. (1981). Meta-analysis in Social Research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Hasazi, S. B., Gordon, L. R., & Roe, C. A. (9185). Factors Associated with the Employment Status of Handicapped Youth Exiting High School from 1979 to 1983. The Council for Exceptional Children, 51,(6), 455-469.

Hedges, L. V. (1985). Statistical Methods for Meta-analysis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kavale, K. A., & Glass, G. V. (1982). The Efficacy of Special Education Interventions and Practices: A Compendium of Meta-Analysis Findings. Focus on Exceptional Children, 15(4), 2-22.

Kernan, K. T., & Koegel, P. (1984). Employment Experiences of Community-Based Mildly Retarded Adults, 1980. In R. B. Edgerton (Ed.), Lives in Process: Mildly Retarded Adults in A Large City. Monographs of the American Association on Mental Deficiency, No. 6. Washington, D.C.: AAMD.

Kolstoe, O. P. (1975). Secondary Programs. In J. M. Kaufman & J. S. Payne (Eds., Mental Retardation: Introduction and personal perspectives. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Lazar, I., & Darlington, E. (1982). Lasting effects of early education: A report from the consortium for longitudinal studies. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development. 47(2-3) Serial No. 195.

Saenger, G. (1957). The adjustment of severely retarded adults in the community. Albany, NY: State Interdepartmental Health Resources Board.

Snyder, S., & Sheehan, R. (1983). Integrating research in early childhood special education: The use of meta-analysis. Diagnostique, 9, 12-25.

White, K., & Casto, G. (1985). An integrative review of early intervention efficacy studies with at-risk children: Implications for the handicapped. Analysis and Intervention in Developmental Disabilities 5, 7-31.

Research Faculty at the University of Illinois

Janis Chadsey-Rusch
Visiting Assistant Professor
of Special Education

Lizanne DeStefano
Visiting Assistant Professor
of Educational Psychology

Jane Dowling
Visiting Assistant Professor
of Special Education

James W. Halle
Assistant Professor of
Special Education

Delwyn L. Harnisch
Assistant Professor of
Educational Psychology

Laird W. Heal
Professor of Special
Education

Robert L. Linn
Professor of Educational
Psychology

L. Allen Phelps
Professor of Vocational
Education

Adelle M. Renzaglia
Associate Professor of
Special Education

Frank R. Rusch
Professor of Special
Education

Richard P. Schutz
Visiting Assistant Professor
of Special Education

Robert E. Stake
Professor of Educational
Psychology

Institute Advisory Committee

Secondary Transition Intervention Effectiveness Institute
University of Illinois

Donn Brolin, Ph.D.
Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology
University of Missouri-Columbia

R. Brian Cobb, Ph.D.
Department of Special Education
University of Vermont

Marge Goldberg, *Co-Director*
Pacer Center
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Sally S. Höerr, *President*
National Parent Chain
Peoria, Illinois

Dean Inman, Ph.D.
Director of NERC
Center on Human Development
University of Oregon

Luanna Meyer, Ph.D.
Division of Special Education and Rehabilitation
Syracuse University

William Schill, Ph.D.
College of Education
University of Washington

Susan S. Suter, *Director*
Illinois Department of Rehabilitation Services

Edna Szymanski
American Rehabilitation Counseling Association
Senior Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor
New York State Office of Vocational Rehabilitation

Craig Thornton, Ph.D.
Mathematica Policy Research
Princeton, New Jersey

Paul Wehman, Ph.D.
Director
Rehabilitation, Research and Training Center
Virginia Commonwealth University